



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and her cheek flushed, "I feel sometimes that I hold but the second place in his heart; or, at least, in his pleasures; and I think with sadness, that he would be less unhappy were he to lose me, than if by some accident he were to lose his art."

This is my story. I think I have proved my comparison to be just; and you will allow that it is love for his Art, and not for the method or process merely, which attaches a true artist to the veriest trifles which serve him in his cherished works, from which alone he hopes to obtain pleasure, honor, and glory.

Architecture.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.

Regular Meeting of January 4, 1859.—The minutes of the last meeting having been read and approved, the treasurer presented his report for the year ending January 4th, which was accepted; a vote of thanks was tendered to J. W. Ritch, for the satisfactory manner in which the finances of the Institute had been attended to. The librarian then read his report for the past year, and at the same time presented to the Institute "Pugin and Britton's Public Buildings of London"—a donation from Joseph Sands, Esq., to whom a vote of thanks was also tendered. The report of the Board of Trustees was unanimously accepted. Officers appointed for the ensuing year: Richard Upjohn, president; Thomas U. Walter, vice-president; Joseph C. Wells, treasurer; Richard M. Hunt, secretary and librarian.

The general business of the evening having been attended to, Mr. Henry Van Brunt read the following paper:

In the paper read before you at our last meeting by a distinguished member of the Institute, there appears to have been a general misapprehension of my intention when opening this discussion on iron. It was not an attempt to prove that iron should supersede stone as a building material, or that stone in any respect should lose that monumental eminence which through all the centuries of architecture it has so proudly earned. Far from it. My object was to prove that, as iron was a material peculiarly adapted to meet many modern emergencies of practical building, *scilicet* it contained within itself a facility for *pure architectural decoration*, which, notwithstanding the obloquy heaped on the very name of cast iron, should recommend it to the peculiar study of architects.

I expected that if my essay provoked opposition, much use would be made of those terms of contempt which custom has associated with the artistic use of cast iron. I can easily conceive that a mind harmonized and sanctified by contemplation of the beautiful causes and effects of ancient architecture (causes which, by the by, have no existence now, and effects, therefore, which scarcely should be emulated)—I admit that a mind so trained, and an eye rendered fastidious by the study of time-touched sculpture, would naturally shrink from the use of a material utterly devoid of poetic associations, and to which is attached the idea of cheapness and meanness, newness and flimsiness. Yet I trust I will be pardoned if, while admitting the force of some of the strictures of Mr. Eidlitz, I am not conscious that he has touched the heart of this matter. In his ardor to destroy this modern spectre that haunts the Wallalla of art, and dis-

mays the cultivated sense of the beautiful, he has attacked only those most apparent and popular aspects of it, which are too frequently fit subjects for generous scorn, without examining into its hidden capacities, and fairly analyzing its possible applications. It is not just, for instance, to talk about concealing a noble masonic arch with "a veil of flimsy and trifling ornament, bought at shops, and hung up with tenpenny nails," when the question is not of where it is obtained or how it is obtained, where it is placed or how it is placed, but of the uses of ornament abstractly, and in what degree even the noblest intentions of ornament may be met by cast iron.

I have ever acknowledged and, I think, felt that architecture was the "art of expressing in the construction of a building the uses and purposes for which it is erected." And, by the by, when I stated that *we expect in a building little more than the pure architectural expression of fitness for its peculiar purposes*, it seems to me that I merely uttered a parallel to that definition, and am consequently surprised to find that I am attacked at this point with peculiar force. Howbeit, bearing this definition in my mind, I am yet to be convinced that cast iron, though used superficially, necessarily offends against its requirements; for I do not propose to *conceal* construction, but to *illustrate* it and give it honor, and in thus emphasizing that construction I assist in its expression. I would use iron as a decorative language, and as such I take especial pleasure in its practical uselessness. In this uselessness is its eloquence and chief beauty, and when I affix it to my arch; or in any way cause it to accompany my arch, not in the form of "pretty ornaments," or "unmeaning ornaments," or "trifling and flimsy ornaments," but in decorative forms suited to the peculiar spirit of that arch, I conceive that I honor and illustrate that feature by so doing. It is not a question how I secure that ornament in its place, whether it be as the bronzes were secured to the pediments of the Roman Pantheon, or even as the abortive ornaments are stuck on a modern stove. This is not the question, so long as I confess my material, and am not ashamed of my manner of applying it. I would not undertake this method whimsically, or without reason, but if it were desirable to enrich the arch at all, or to decorate any other constructive feature, and if I could not afford to carve that enrichment in the stone itself, or in any way express it in the brick, which I would of course prefer to do, I know of no aesthetical reason why I should not avail myself of any cheaper and durable material for that purpose.

From this point it becomes merely a question of degree. To what extent are we to allow ourselves to use such decoration? To this no one mind could undertake to attach sumptuary laws of limitation; and whether this system, if used at all, must be confined to emphasizing points, or whether, a more important feature, it may be spread as a screen or otherwise over a whole facade, it is scarcely for us to decide. It is one of those things which, beginning with small things, are developed by time. A Minerva-birth in art is impossible. I am aware that the temptation to overuse an ornament so facile would be great, and that this facility would tend to lessen its value. It is evident, therefore, that there would be a greater demand for study and thought in such a decoration, and that the architect would shrink from the use of any conventional ornament, which, while allowable in stone, the difficulties of which would chastise its use, in iron would be commonplace from its *fatal availability*. Thus, instead of demanding the authority of the schools, he would be compelled to refer to the book of Nature for suggestions, or obtain appropriate novelty from the infinity

of geometric design. This is a point which, with all diffidence, I would earnestly urge upon your attention, and ask if, considering these things, the more general employment of cast iron in external decorations, instead of degrading art, might not even tend to elevate it. For I believe there is nothing inherent in this material to render its forms necessarily frivolous or unmeaning.

I did not think it necessary that I should acknowledge in my paper that there are many cases where the use of such decoration would be inadmissible. Who would disturb the severity of a vast wall of stone, if this quality were desirable for expression, with any ornamentation, whether of iron or of any other material, or who would transform the serious grandeur of the cathedral into the jolly amusement of the kaleidoscope? But I am forced to the conviction that a new means for architectural expression, which might be applicable for less monumental purposes, would not threaten to supersede or interfere with any desirable effects of stone or brick.

I ask your indulgent attention but for one point more, and as this is one of vital importance to this question, I hope you will pardon my consuming a few minutes more of your time. I refer to the admission of the principle of mechanical subordination and obedience in the present day, in contradiction to that of the "liberty of the workman," which I consider obsolete. For I conceive, that as far as all aesthetic considerations are concerned, on the admission of this principle of mechanical obedience depends the admissibility of *machine ornament* in our architecture. I have carefully examined the attack of my distinguished critic on this portion of my argument, and I am obtuse enough not to perceive that he has fairly met me. I attempted to state *in extenso* that the *craft-spirit*, the enthusiastic devotion of workmen to their calling, does not and cannot influence labor now to the extent that it did in the middle ages. This seems to me incontrovertible, and is virtually admitted by that gentleman when he says that "wars with sword and wars of words, political changes, migration from place to place, have crowded out of our midst the intense love of and appreciation for art possessed by our fathers." If this love ever returns to us, and we are assured that it will, it never can bring back with it that quaint and romantic principle of the liberty of labor, which would render mechanical ornamentation of any kind in the highest degree base and unworthy. I can imagine no principle so utterly opposed to the spirit of our age. I did not undertake to assume that workmen are no longer interested in the work they perform. The gentleman misunderstood me in this respect, and I agree with him that such a state of affairs would be indeed disastrous. It was merely my intention to draw a comparative estimate of the *craft-spirit* of the two ages, and it does not seem to me difficult to prove that that of our time is enough inferior to that of the thirteenth century to render necessary, for the credit of our works, the most complete mechanical subordination; and the more thorough this subordination is, the less value does hand labor have as such, and consequently the less objectionable is machine ornament in our architecture. I do not believe it has fallen within that gentleman's extensive experience ever to have met a workman to whom he would have intrusted the carving of a capital or corbel without careful drawings and constant supervision, and I would be happy to be corrected if he has met with any workman of whom he would be willing to say, in the fullness of the language of his illustrious countryman—

"Das er im innern Herzen spüret
Was er erschafft mit seiner Hand."

I am aware that many practical considerations, such as durability, etc., have not been touched upon in my paper; but I shall be content if I have succeeded in seriously awakening this Institute as a body to this subject, and I am sure that a careful and thorough consideration of it here cannot but have a good influence upon ourselves and upon architecture in this country.

Regular Meeting, Tuesday, July 18th.—The minutes of the last meeting having been read and accepted, the librarian presented to the Institute "Hart's Parish Churches"—a donation from the author, to whom a vote of thanks was tendered.

R. G. Hatfield, J. C. Wells, and R. M. Hunt, were appointed a committee of three to draw up a diploma for the Institute.

By order,

R. M. HUNT, *Secretary.*

We take from the Newburg *Daily News* the following description of a new Presbyterian church lately erected in that village. The architect is Frederick C. Withers :

This building is in the style of the early geometrical Gothic; the walls are of blue stone, the refuse of the flag quarries, laid in random courses. The dressings of windows and doorways are of grey sandstone from quarries near Kingston, here used for the first time; none of these stones are of great size, the quarry producing but few as thick as ten inches—the average thickness of the stones in the church being six inches, this proving that it is by no means necessary to use large blocks of stone to produce a grand and massive effect. The roofs are covered with red and blue slates laid in geometrical patterns.

The building consists of a nave, with side aisles divided by arcades of six inches, all of stone, with a clerestory above, and a session room at the end. The interval dimensions are—nave, 97 feet long, by 25 feet wide, and 50 feet high to the ridge. The aisles are 17 feet wide, but they are 14 feet shorter than the nave; the total width inside is 64 feet. The tower is at the end of the north aisle, and is twenty feet six inches square; it will be surmounted by a spire of grey stone (now nearly completed), making a total of 135 feet from the ground. There is only one gallery—intended for the organ and choir, at the east end of the nave. Thirteen feet under the gallery an entrance lobby is formed, opening into the centre passage, as well as into that of the north aisle, through an archway in the tower.

The roof timbers are all of pine, exposed to view on the inside; over the nave the roof is constructed with hammer beams and curved braces, resting on stone corbels. All the roofs are covered with boardings, between which and the slating there is a space of six inches—which is an excellent means, not only of equalizing the temperature of the church, but also of causing a reflection of the sound, in which respect it answers admirably. The seats are framed in yellow pine, with sloping backs and low doors; they contain, with the gallery, accommodations for 826 adults, but wide passages and room round the pulpit afford facilities for seating 1,000 persons, by using chairs. The pulpit, or desk, is of oak, placed under an arched recess opposite the principal entrance; it is four feet above the floor, and is to be furnished with embroidered velvet hangings, the gift of the architect. The recess is decorated with a row of beautiful encaustic tiles; the space above will be filled with fresco drapery, and below a hanging of pink and gold will reach to the top of the ornamental oak framing at the back of the pulpit. Above the arch will be written in illuminated letters on a scroll, "Give unto the Lord the glory due unto His name. Worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness." It is in contemplation to fill up the spandrels, between the arches, in a similar manner, with texts of scripture.

The windows are all of stained glass, and all manufactured in New York, by Henry Sharp, except two, which were made by Lavers, of London, England. One of the London windows in the west of the north aisle, was presented to the church by Miss F. E. Sistare, of Newburg. It is a window of three lights, the centre one containing a geometrical pattern, with the *Agnus Dei* in a medallion, and the pious donor's monogram in two small circles above.